UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/749,902	12/29/2003	Alexander A. Maltsev	884.B54US1	1418	
	7590	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 2938		SINKANTARAKORN, PAWARIS			
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2464		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/22/2010	ELECTRONIC	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com request@slwip.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/749,902	MALTSEV ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Pao Sinkantarakorn	2464	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>28 January 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(see MPEP 706.07).	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed water Notice of Appeal was filed on	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw);	TE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 2,5,7,12-13,18-21, and 26-27. Claim(s) objected to: 24.		l be entered and an e:	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: <u>24.</u> Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3,4,6,8-11,14,15,16,17,22, and 23.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Ricky Ngo/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2464	/Pao Sinkantarakorn/ Examiner, Art Unit 2464		
	LAMINION, ALL UNIL 2404		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The Applicants amended claim 16 to overcome 35 U.S.C. 112 2nd paragraph rejection. Thus, the 112 2nd paragraph rejection is withdrawn. However, claim 16 is still rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

On pages 2-3 of the Remarks, The Applicants submit that Tu does not teach "a subchannel filter selection switch to provide an analog baseband signal to a selected one of the subchannel low-pass filters."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Firstly, there is no structure defining the subchannel filter selection switch in claim 1 or claim 16. Secondly, the steps of providing a signal to a selected one of the subchannel filters are not specifically defined in the claim. Thus, the Examiner is entitled to interpret the claims as broadly as the claim language allows. The Examiner interprets Figure 4A of Tu as teaching the subchannel filter selection switch, where paragraphs 40-45 describe Figure 4A. As shown in Figure 4A of Tu, RF Switch 412 receives input RF signal and provides the received input signal to BPF WB 422. The signal is then independently passed on to each of the mixers 432, and then each mixer provides the signal to Low Pass Filters. Please note that there are multiple LPFs but only one LPF is shown in Figure 4A. The step of providing signal from BPF WB 422 to the mixers and eventually to LPFs can be broadly interpreted as the subchannel filter selection switch to provide an analog baseband signal to a selected one of the subchannel low-pass filters since the step of providing a signal to a selected one of the subchannel filters are not specifically defined in the claim. Thus, the Examiner believes the 103(a) rejection should be sustained. The Examiner respectfully suggests the Applicants to amend the subchannel filter selection switch to futher define the step of selecting a subchannel filter to overcome Tu.